Mr. Jeremy Gunn
AARB
600 E St., NW, 2d floor
Washington, DC 20530

5/13/95

Harold Weisberg
7627 Old Receiver Rd.
Frederick, MD 21702

Dear Jeremy,

When Tom sent me a notice of your May 3 meeting I wrote and asked that the record of that meeting, which was to consider what is defined as an assassination record, incorporate what I have been trying to persuade the board should be incorporated in the definition. His reply was to insult my intelligence. He said what is meaningless except as an effort to deceive me, which it did not, that my "letter will become a part of the Board's permanenrt records." That is true of every piece of paper you have, he knows it and he knows I know it. In the mass of records you will leave that by law are required to be publicly available what you (pl) have done is to see to it that what I regard as an essential assassination record under the law not be where those having any interest in the board and how it functioned will never find it. And I think I have qualifications to offer an opinion. What the board has done in this is to memory-hole what I regard is a deliberate and serious refusal to do what the law required of it. At the least as a dissent it should be available to those with a future interest in th board and how it did and did not work.

Then Tom did send me the transcript of that session and I looked at it. I found that it does have attachments to the transcriot and that in its deliberations the board was pleased about how it was handling "theories" and more than merely pleased about it Boston session, where it was told, among other insanities and stupidities, to get the real limousine windshield that had by some means been hidden and replaced by a phony one.

When the board regarded that session as more than merely satisfactory it defines itself as no enemy can.

I saw no use of such words as "fact" or "evidence" in the May 3 transcript and if they and what they represent have been used or thought of by the board I have no knowledge of it. On indication of it.

As you know, I have taken the time to give the board proof of the existence of essential records relating to what you lawyers call the body of the crime and of felonies committed to make them unavailable. This and other information in the form of official documents that I have given the board are as I understand the Act and its intent within it but "theories" I do not recall reading in it.

I have no influence over what the board does and how it files and none of us can know what the future holds. However, I am without doubt that there will be questions about the board and about assassination records that will remain and to diligent scholars serious questions about what the board did and did not do. There will be copies of my correspondence with the board in other deposits and if there is searching in the

board's records by subject and this correspondence is not filed as I asked that will in the future at the very least reflect on the board and its staff. It will permit what will be at least a reasonable interpretation of the board in terms of some of the titles and subtitles of my books, like whitewash and cover-up. There will be post mortems. And the hope of my book now on sale, NEVER AGAIN!, will be seen as unjutsified optimism.

Then there is the book not published with the title, Waketh the Watchman. Which it is now clear the board was not. I think did not intend to be.

(If you have NEVER AGAIN! it was by accident printed without the index. If you want a copy, I can provide a xerox.)

I sent Dr. Nelson a copy of some of what I wrote earlier. I was returned to me as incorrectly addressed. I enclose it with the request that you please get it to her.

I also write her, enclosed, and ask that you please get that to her.

As you know, my work includes an examination of how in that time of great tragedy and since then all our basic institutions failed and have continued to fail. ~~since then.~~ I regret that as a matter of choice the board has added itself to the long list.

Sincerely,

Harold

Harold Weisberg

On Sparrow as an asset used by our government against critics and against criticism the FBI has disclosed some of its London Legat files confirming this, its 62-358 file. Published in England are Serials 23, 27, 66, 70 and 85, with redactions that seem to hold more relevant information. These records reflect that he was used for more than that Times of London Literary Supplement 18,000 word article in the way I say. The British author's search for the publisher who republished that article here as a small book shows it does not exist. But I see in the 5/3 transcript that the board regarded Giancana, or was it Regano, records as important. If Regano, which of his contradictory versions neither one of which means anything at all?